

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
9 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
10

11 DANIEL JAMES,

No. CIV.S-05-0289 GEB DAD PS

12 Plaintiff,

13 v.

ORDER

14 THOMAS BLAIR, et al.,

15 Defendants.  
16 \_\_\_\_\_/


17 By order to show cause filed June 28, 2005, plaintiff, who  
18 is proceeding pro se, was directed to show cause in writing why this  
19 case should not be dismissed for lack of subject matter jurisdiction.  
20 Plaintiff timely filed the required response along with a request for  
21 extension of time to further respond to the order to show cause  
22 through counsel. Plaintiff represents that an attorney has agreed to  
23 represent him in this matter, although the court notes that no  
24 substitution of counsel is on file.

25 In light of the circumstances, plaintiff's request for  
26 extension of time is granted in part. Plaintiff shall have an

1 additional thirty (30) days from the date of this order to respond to  
2 the order to show cause regarding subject matter jurisdiction.

3 IT IS SO ORDERED.

4 DATED: August 2, 2005.

5 

6 DALE A. DROZD

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

DAD:th

7 Ddadl\orders.prose\james0289.eot